

DDA Policy

Training 3

30 OCT 1974

Mr. Howard Sollenberger  
 Director, Foreign Service Institute  
 Department of State  
 Washington, D.C. 20505

Dear Mr. Sollenberger:

Your letter of 25 September 1974 regarding the FSI Area Program was of considerable interest. CIA has found the Area Program useful in preparing personnel for both overseas and research assignments. You proposed in the letter that the agencies most directly concerned maintain the basic area studies facility on a shared basis, with CIA providing \$33,977 and FSI guaranteeing enrollment of up to 90 students per year.

Our records show attendance in area courses at FSI of 42 students in FY 74 at a cost of \$20,874. Estimated enrollments for FY 75 are in the order of 60 students. We have no way of estimating or projecting enrollment beyond FY 75 within any degree of accuracy. With shrinking resources we do not feel we can make a firm commitment of money or people for the future. We hope to continue to use your facilities, however, in the same manner we have in the past. If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact me.

STATINTL Sincerely,



Alfonso Rodriguez  
 Director of Training

Distribution:

0 & 1 - Adse  
 1 - DDA  
 2 - DTR  
 1 - PDS  
 1 - TAP

STATINTL



WASHINGTON

September 25, 1975

Mr. Alfonso Rodriquez  
Director of Training  
Central Intelligence Agency  
Washington, D.C. 20505

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

Since its founding the Foreign Service Institute has considered that the offering of comprehensive foreign language and area training programs to all agencies of the Government with foreign affairs functions is basic to the role envisaged for the Institute by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, the legislation which authorized its establishment. This view of the fundamental importance of language and area instruction has been justified by the fact that over the years the Department of State and other agencies with foreign affairs functions have sent thousands of employees and dependents to FSI for training in these basic arts of modern, multi-faceted diplomacy. We believe that the high quality of FSI language and area courses has fulfilled users' needs and expectations. As a result, there has been high compliance with the Act's provision that "Other agencies of the Government shall wherever practicable avoid duplicating the facilities of the Institute and the training provided by the Secretary at the Institute or elsewhere." No agency could independently offer the range of courses, frequency of offerings and flexibility required by our worldwide Service. Thus, it has been and continues to be in our mutual interest to combine training effort in this field.

The School of Language Studies is heavily used by all agencies and continues to comprise approximately one-half of the Institute's enrollments. This heavy usage enables us to offer regularly a comprehensive schedule of instruction in a wide variety of languages and dialects. Thus, the FSI language program is healthy and dynamic.

I have felt it necessary to provide this brief background as introduction to the important matter which I want to raise in this letter -- the need for concerned agencies to consider means to improve the prospect of the area studies program.

The problem we face is, in brief, that the steady decline over the past five years in non-State usage of the area studies program already has forced lessening the frequency of specific course offerings and threatens to affect the viability of the entire program as a fundamental part of FSI's training effort. In view of the language of the Foreign Service Act defining the multi-agency nature of the Institute, and Section 500 that states the expectation of the Congress that employees shall have to the maximum practical extent a knowledge of the language and the area in anticipation of an assignment overseas, I feel it is necessary to advise you of the situation and to seek your cooperation in reaching a solution.

State and other agencies' area studies use has declined 69.6% since FY 1967. State itself has dropped 53.6% in this period.

A number of reasons are adduced for these declined enrollments: general budget stringencies in all agencies, contracting rather than expanding programs overseas, reduced personnel recruitments, fewer inter-area personnel transfers, lessened priority given training by agency management and, perhaps most distressing, that personnel assigned overseas cannot wait for courses given less frequently than was the case in earlier years.

We have undertaken a number of useful palliatives to ease the problem, such as reducing the minimum number of students required to schedule a course and arranging for specialized, tutorial type treatment for many officers unable to attend a schedule offering. I can assure you that we have maintained the quality of the area studies courses.

Our study of this problem has been based on the premise that area competence is necessary for early and full effectiveness in an overseas assignment, that the requisite orientation can best be disseminated through a series of organized FSI courses and that, consequently, the various agencies have an interest in contributing to a mutually beneficial solution to the problem. We also have taken into account that the major using agencies have a stake in assuring the continuation of area studies courses.

I propose, therefore, that the maintenance of a basic area studies facility be jointly maintained on a shared basis by the agencies most directly concerned.

For this purpose, we have segregated the using agencies into two categories -- those relatively heavy users whose participation will be necessary to the success of our shared support concept, and those other more occasional user agencies which will continue to send students at approximately the present volume and which will be charged a fixed tuition rate.

Appropriate officials of the major using agencies, to whom this letter is addressed, will readily discern from the attached data, that a truly modest increase in overall payment will, through the sharing concept, enable a dramatic increase in numbers of students each agency could send to the area studies courses. Your agency, for example, could increase its student input from 45 to 90 (increase of 100%) for only \$33,977 (increase of \$10,217).

We envisage that your agency's agreement to participate in this plan would enable you to send as a minimum a number of students equal to its percentage portion of participation, either employees or dependents as you might wish. Additionally, to the extent that unused class space is available, extra-quota students could be sent at no further charge.

These computations assume that smaller volume, less regular users will send approximately 43 students in FY 1975, which will be about the same as current enrollment. Charges to sharing agreement users would be subject to minor adjustment if this anticipated usage level is not reached or exceeded.

The method of computing funding for this sharing formula would operate as follows:

- (1) In the fourth quarter of each fiscal year, each of the primary agencies will project its student input for the next fiscal year. FSI will query the non-primary agencies as to their projected levels of student input. The primary agencies will then reach agreement on total estimated input for the next fiscal year.
- (2) FSI will prepare an estimated program cost for conducting the scheduled Area and Country Study courses for the fiscal year. The estimate will be reviewed by the primary agencies.
- (3) Based upon the projected level of input provided by the agencies, FSI will pro-rate total program costs to the agencies. A schedule reflecting, by agency, student

input and estimated program cost will be submitted to the primary agencies.

(4) For reimbursement billing, the cost to the non-primary agencies will continue to be charged on a tuition rate. However, should the projected enrollment from these agencies either increase or decrease the required level of reimbursable income, the primary agencies' shared costs would be promptly adjusted for the following year. It is not believed that this adjustment would be large. Cost to the primary agencies would be the guaranteed level of funding as agreed to at the beginning of each fiscal year.

(5) Unanticipated increases in student input over established student quotas by the primary agencies will not result in an increased cost to that agency as long as the extra student enrollment is in regularly scheduled courses of instruction.

I would be pleased to have your reaction to this proposal as soon as convenient to you. I would also be happy to have whatever suggestions you might have concerning this problem which we face mutually.

Sincerely,



Howard E. Sollenberger  
Director

Enclosure:  
Chart